UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2622nd MEETING: 11 OCTOBER 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2622)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The Middle East problem including the Palestinian question:	
Letter dated 30 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17507)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2622nd MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 11 October 1985, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Vernon A. WALTERS
(United States of America).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2622)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The Middle East problem including the Palestinian question:
   Letter dated 30 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17507)

The meeting was called to order at 4.15 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The Middle East problem including the Palestinian question:
Letter dated 30 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17507)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item [*2619th to 2621st meetings*], I invite the observer for the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Bangladesh, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Israel, Kuwait, Morocco, Pakistan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Qaddoumi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. Choudhury (Bangladesh), Mr. César (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Alfi (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Sastradidjaya (Indonesia), Mr. Bein (Israel), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Alaoui (Morocco), Mr. Yaqub-Khan (Pakistan), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Cuba and Jordan in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Oramus Oliva (Cuba) and Mr. Salah (Jordan) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bangladesh, Mr. Humayun Rasheed Choudhury. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. CHOUDHURY (Bangladesh): Mr. President, it is a privilege for me and the members of my delegation to take part in this important debate and I wish to thank you and the other members of the Council for giving us this opportunity.

5. My delegation has already had the privilege of congratulating you on your assumption of the presidency for the month of October. During the past few days, we have seen ample evidence of your leadership and diplomatic skill, which reinforces our firm conviction that, under your able guidance, the Council will achieve fruitful and constructive results.

6. It is most befitting that the Council should, during this historic month of October, which marks the observance of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, be deliberating upon an important issue like the Middle East problem including the Palestinian question. No other issue in contemporary history has been discussed and deliberated upon so extensively, and yet the problem remains unresolved and continues to threaten international peace and security.

7. The current Council deliberations on this important issue are taking place in pursuance of the decision taken at

the recently concluded Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries held at Luanda. The representative of India, in his capacity as the Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, has called for the convening of this meeting, and we fully support that initiative. The Council has shown exemplary determination during the past week in dealing with the two latest acts of aggression by Israel and South Africa against Tunisia and Angola, respectively. It is our sincere hope and expectation that the Council will demonstrate the same determination and political will in dealing with the important question currently on its agenda.

8. The present explosive situation in the Middle East is a direct consequence of a historic injustice, perpetrated when the Palestinian people were forcibly uprooted from their hearths and homes and an alien people were virtually imposed upon the Arab world through the creation of Israel. That newly created State from the outset adopted an aggressive and hostile policy against the Palestinian people and its Arab neighbours. In violation of all canons of international law and the Charter of the United Nations, Israel, on the pretext of waging so-called defensive wars, has carried out a series of acts of aggression and has occupied huge Arab territories. Despite repeated calls by the General Assembly and the Security Council, Israel has refused to vacate the occupied Arab and Palestinian lands.

9. All the efforts of the United Nations to bring justice to the suffering Palestinian and Arab people have been arrogantly and blatantly rejected by Israel, which has openly flouted the will of the international community. At the same time, Israel has further intensified its policy of relentless expansion and occupation directed against its Arab neighbours with a view to changing the Arab and Palestinian character of the occupied territories. In clear contravention of the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949,[1] the Palestinian and Arab people living in the occupied territories have been persecuted, terrorized and denied their basic fundamental rights.

10. Israeli attempts to annex the Holy City of Jerusalem and the Syrian Golan Heights and change their status have been unequivocally condemned by the international community and have been declared null and void. Israel committed an act of aggression against Iraq in 1981, and invaded Lebanon in 1982. At the beginning of the current month, Israel, in violation of all norms of international law and of the principles and purposes of the Charter, unleashed yet another act of aggression against the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Tunisia, a country which is more than 2400 kilometres from its borders. Israel's latest aggression is yet another manifestation of its relentless drive to eliminate the Palestinian people and their sole legitimate representative, the PLO.

11. The acts of aggression committed by Israel against its Arab neighbours cannot be justified on any moral or legal basis. Nor can we accept the Israeli argument that Israel has the right to attack any State at any time on the pretext of the self-conceived notion of its defence considerations. We must firmly oppose the propagation of such a new doctrine of State terrorism, the only purpose of which is to continue to acquire new territories through acts of aggression.

12. In my statement in the General Assembly I said that the international community, and particularly the United Nations, has been concerned with the problem of international terrorism for some time now. However, no concrete and effective action has yet been taken by us to put a stop to these criminal acts which take a heavy toll of innocent human lives, at the same time threatening international peace and security. Recent terroristic acts have again reaffirmed the need for concerted action by the international community. Bangladesh condemns terrorism in all its forms, whenever and by whomsoever committed. Terrorism begets terrorism. No noble and purposeful objective can be achieved through terroristic acts. We therefore very strongly urge that some initiative be taken in that regard at the current session of the General Assembly.

13. It is now universally recognized that the question of Palestine is at the core of the problem of the Middle East and that consequently it is not possible to envisage a settlement of the problems in the Middle East unless the legitimate inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people are fully restored. Bangladesh, in the past, has reiterated its firm conviction that the complex and interrelated problems in the Middle East call for a comprehensive solution which must be based on a total and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Palestinian and Arab territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, and the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people under the leadership of the PLO, their sole legitimate representative.

14. The developments in the Middle East have also demonstrated beyond any shadow of doubt that the problems in the region can be solved only through a concerted international effort under the auspices of the United Nations. My delegation, therefore, attaches particular importance to the early convening of the proposed international peace conference on the Middle East, and we fully appreciate the Secretary-General's current initiative to that end. The Arab peace plan, which my delegation fully supports as a sound basis for a comprehensive solution of the problem, as well as other plans which have been submitted recently, are already before the international community. What is needed now to initiate the peace process is the generation of the necessary political will, particularly on the part of the major Powers which are in a position to influence developments in the region. The most recent developments in the Middle East have once again reminded us of the grave and explosive situation which prevails in that region. Any further delay in starting the peace process might trigger a totally unmanageable crisis, making it more difficult, if not impossible, to restore peace in the Middle East.

15. It is unfortunate that while the international community is making a determined effort to restore peace in the region, Israel has undertaken a systematic effort to thwart the peace process. In the face of a growing interna-

tional consensus in favour of the Arab and Palestinian cause, Israel has once again resorted to the use of force to heighten tension in the region with a view to frustrating the current international effort to resolve peacefully the problems in the Middle East. We commend all those who in the face of such unprovoked aggression and relentless expansion have demonstrated the utmost restraint, and have made every possible effort to try and bring about a durable peace in the Middle East.

16. The Security Council—particularly its permanent members—has a special responsibility to bring peace in the Middle East. The failure of the Council in the past to ensure implementation of its own decisions and resolutions has only encouraged Israel to intensify its policies of aggression against the Palestinian people and its Arab neighbours, thereby threatening international peace and security. It is our sincere hope that the Council, during the present deliberations, will show foresight and wisdom in dealing with one of the most explosive issues of our times.

17. At the historic commemorative meeting of the Council, held on 26 September [*2608th meeting*], all members agreed that there was an urgent need to enhance the effectiveness of the Council in carrying out its principal role in the maintenance of international peace and security and also resolved to continue to examine the possibilities of further improvement of its functioning. My delegation believes that that spirit should guide the current Council deliberations on the adoption of effective, concrete measures for the initiation of the peace process in the Middle East.

18. The observance of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations will be over in a matter of weeks. The occasion is indeed historic and we are confident that the Council will not fail history.

19. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the German Democratic Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

20. Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): I have already had the opportunity to extend to you, Sir, the congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of October. I should like to thank you, and through you the members of the Council, for giving me the opportunity to explain the position of the German Democratic Republic on the subject under consideration today.

21. We noted with deep satisfaction that at its meeting at Minister for Foreign Affairs level, held a few weeks ago to commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations [*ibid.*], the Council reaffirmed the urgent need to do everything possible to enhance its effectiveness in preserving world peace and international security.

22. Particularly in our nuclear and space age, it is imperative to settle international conflicts through negotiation, by exclusively peaceful means. That is especially true of the settlement of the Middle East problem, at the core of which is the question of Palestine.

23. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic shares the view that it is high time to end the permanent state of tension in the region and to bring about a just and lasting peace. Accordingly, it welcomes the timely initiative taken by the non-aligned countries at the Conference of Foreign Ministers, held at Luanda in September, concerning the convening of these meetings of the Council.

24. The debates over the past few days and weeks in various United Nations bodies have underlined the deep concern of the overwhelming majority of representatives over the explosive situation in the Middle East and its adverse consequences for world peace and international security. This is only natural, since the international community has witnessed the escalation of the policy of State terrorism pursued by those in the ruling Israeli circles against the people of Palestine and the Arab States.

25. That policy of disregarding all the norms of international law and the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations is made manifest in the outrages of the Israeli aggressors in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories and by the acts of aggression perpetrated against Lebanon and Tunisia, acts which are resolutely condemned by the German Democratic Republic.

26. Therefore, it has been pointed out time and again in the Council that it is Israel's policy of aggression which forms the main obstacle to a comprehensive, just and durable settlement of the Middle East problem and the Palestinian question. It is the Israeli rulers who, in defiance of numerous United Nations resolutions, deny the Palestinian people the exercise of their inalienable rights, especially the right to establish a State of their own. And it is also they who obstruct the convening of the international peace conference on the Middle East called for by the overwhelming majority of Member States in General Assembly resolution 38/58 C of 13 December 1983.

27. There can also be no doubt that in its actions Israel enjoys the unqualified support of the main imperialist Power. United in the so-called strategic alliance, the United States and Israel seek to involve the Arab region to an ever greater extent in imperialism's global confrontation course to expand its military presence and to extend the range of North Atlantic Treaty Organization operations to that part of the world.

28. A constituent part of the imperialist attempt to gain domination in the Middle East region, which is so sensitive for world peace, is the policy of separate deals. Its aim is to remove the Middle East problem and the Palestinian question from the agenda and to perpetuate the occupation of Arab territories, in violation of international law. It is but a futile attempt to deceive the Palestinian people and to deprive it for ever of its national rights.

29. Such plans and practices must be halted. Joint, resolute action by all peace forces becomes ever more imperative. Therefore, the German Democratic Republic welcomes the efforts to enhance the joint, cohesive action of all patriotic Arab forces, on the basis of the Fez peace plan [*see S/15510, annex*].

30. The German Democratic Republic is acting in line with the overwhelming majority of States when, in accordance with United Nations resolutions, it strongly advocates the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all interested parties, including the PLO as the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. For the conference to be successful, the first requirement is a constructive approach by all the permanent members of the Security Council. Israel and the United States are again called upon no longer to block the early convening of the conference.

31. The German Democratic Republic expresses its hope that the Council will take the measures required for the early convening of the international peace conference on the Middle East.

32. A comprehensive, just and durable settlement of the Middle East conflict requires recognition of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to establish an independent State of their own. Israel must withdraw unconditionally from all Arab territories occupied since 1967. Only then can peace and security be guaranteed for all States and peoples in the Middle East.

33. Proceeding from this position, the German Democratic Republic supports the Soviet Union's proposals of July 1984 [*S/16685, annex*], which coincide with the Fez Peace Plan, as the way to a comprehensive, just and durable solution to the Palestinian problem.

34. It reaffirms in this forum that it will continue consistently to support the struggle of the Palestinian people led by the PLO for the implementation of their national rights.

35. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): It would be difficult to find a representative international forum that has not in recent times given close attention to the problem of the Middle East. The Conference of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Luanda in September, was no exception. It is precisely at the request of the parties to that Conference that the Security Council is once again taking up the problem of the Middle East.

36. The concern of the non-aligned countries and many other countries at the turn of events in the Middle East is well founded. For many years now, the Middle East wound has been bleeding, expanding and affecting wider areas. In the period since the Second World War the Middle East has become one of the most dangerous spots on earth. Naturally, the Soviet Union very closely monitors the course of events in that part of the world, which is in direct proximity to our boundaries. We are not only monitoring those events, but are acting with a great sense of responsibility to ensure that the situation in the region does not eventually get out of control. We are seeking and shall continue to seek a political approach to a general and just settlement of the situation in the Middle East.

37. Why is there a constant, general threat not only to the peace and security of the peoples that inhabit that part of the world but to peace in general? And what essentially needs to be done in order to break the present deadlock concerning a Middle East settlement? Obviously, it is precisely to get answers to those questions that the Security Council is now meeting.

38. The reasons for the persistence of the hotbed of tension in the Middle East seem to us to be abundantly clear. They can be seen to be rooted in the aggressive and expansionist policy of the Israeli leadership. In less than 40 years, the Middle East has experienced five destructive and bloody wars. Today, the Syrian Golan Heights, the West Bank of the Jordan, the Gaza Strip, East Jerusalem and southern Lebanon are still under occupation.

39. The main victim of Israeli expansionism has been the Arab people of Palestine. The ruling circles in Tel Aviv are trying to thwart any decision of the United Nations to create two States in Palestine and are attempting forcibly to remove the question of Palestine from the agenda. It is appropriate to remind people again and again that Israel owes its very existence to a decision taken by the United Nations, and that that self-same decision also envisaged the formation of an Arab State in Palestine.

40. The practices of the Israeli leadership unquestionably indicate one thing: that flouting the rights of other peoples, terror and violence have been deliberately raised to the level of State policy. Such a policy is in blatant contradiction of the Charter of the United Nations, the fundamental norms of international law and inter-State relations and numerous resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union said at the current session of the General Assembly:

> "It is hard to imagine that any delegation would venture to assert here that the monstrous crimes of the Israeli aggressors on the ravaged soil of Lebanon and in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip are consistent with the principles of the Charter . . .
>
> "Only chauvinistic arrogance could lead anyone to deny the Palestinian people their right to independent statehood while recognizing that right for the people of Israel. All peoples and nations have equal rights."[2]

41. But to get a complete picture we must add something else. The situation in the Middle East indicates that Israel can pursue its present policies only because of the comprehensive support it receives from Washington. Furthermore, the American-Israeli alliance has perhaps never been characterized by such a high degree of concerted activity as in recent times. I think that the partners in that alliance would not seek to deny that.

42. However, it is perfectly obvious that the struggle of the Arabs for their freedom, independence and honour cannot be overcome by intimidation, blackmail or military adventures. The results of the Israeli adventure in Lebanon have shown the ability of the Arab peoples successfully to defend their legitimate rights.

43. The struggle that the Arabs have had to wage has not been an easy one. Again and again it has shown the importance of the close interaction of the Arab countries and their solidarity. The strength of the Arabs lies in their unity, and their weakness in their being divided. Past and present experience indicates that.

44. Experience, including the unfortunate lessons learned from Camp David, also indicates that the complex and multifaceted problems of the Middle East cannot be tackled on the basis of separate deals. Although even today we see attempts to prompt the Arabs to undertake separate agreements with the aggressor, this is a myopic policy and is fraught with the danger of possibly further complicating the situation in the area.

45. Only the collective method of untying the Gordian knot of contradictions in the Middle East will provide genuine prospects of establishing lasting peace throughout that vast area in which, in the last few decades, there has been so much hostility, mistrust and suspicion. There is a growing conviction in the world that the best way of reaching a comprehensive, just settlement in the Middle East is through the convening of an international conference, with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the PLO and, among other States, the Soviet Union and the United States. It can be said that a State's attitude to the idea of the convening of such a conference has become more or less a criterion of the seriousness of its approach to a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. This is indicated, in particular, by the resolutions adopted by an overwhelming majority in the General Assembly, which show that there is broad international agreement that the only effective way to ensure a radical solution of the Middle East problem is through talks at an international conference on the Middle East.

46. Unfortunately, an obstructionist position regarding the convening of an international conference continues to be taken by both the United States and Israel. They are thus obviously creating the impression that they are not anxious to improve the situation in the Middle East, not anxious that its peoples should return to normal, peaceful life.

47. In opposition to this policy, the Soviet Union holds the firm position that the Middle East cannot be brought to peace by means of a policy of force or by imposing on the conflicting parties something which is alien to their will. We have to try and seek a political solution to this problem. It has to be a comprehensive solution which takes account of the interests of all countries in the area. It is this sort of large-scale programme for a comprehensive Middle East settlement which we find in the Soviet proposals [*ibid.*] which are primarily based on the premise that the principle of the inadmissibility of seizing foreign lands by aggression should be observed. Consequently, the Arabs should have all the territories occupied by Israel since 1967 returned to them. It is essential that the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, whose sole legitimate representative is the PLO, be guaranteed in practice; their right to self-determination and to create their own State in the lands which are freed from Israeli occupation. All States in the area, including, of course, Israel, should be guaranteed the right to a secure and independent existence and development, while observing full mutuality. An end should be put to the state of war, and peace should be established between the Arab States and Israel. Finally, it is proposed that international safeguards be provided for settling the Middle East problem. The Soviet Union is prepared to be involved in those guarantees.

48. Those are the funamental principles on which, in the opinion of the Soviet Union, a just Middle East settlement should be based. As a means of bringing this about, it is proposed that an international conference be convened with the participation of the Arab countries which border on Israel, namely Syria, Jordan, Egypt, Lebanon, the PLO and also Israel itself. Naturally, the Soviet Union and the United States should also be participants in the conference—two States, which by dint of the situation which has arisen, play an important part in Middle-East affairs—and certain other States as well.

49. As the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gorbachev, said:

> "Everything that is happening in the Middle East alarms us. And we have never remained outside attempts to seek a settlement of the situation in the Middle East on a just basis."

50. The Soviet Union has frequently indicated its readiness to co-operate constructively with all those who are sincerely concerned in bringing about a just and durable peace in the Middle East. We should like to reiterate this readiness here today in the Security Council.

51. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations, to whom the Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure at its 2,620th meeting. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

52. Mr. MAKSOUD: Mr. President, I should like to express the appreciation of the League of Arab States for the kind invitation you have extended to me, and through you, to the members of the Council.

53. The meeting of the Council has as its objective to try and bring about an input into the thinking of how best to exhaust the political and diplomatic option which the mechanism of the United Nations can provide in order that we can minimize violence, terrorism, occupation and

the drain on the credibility of the United Nations, the credibility of the prospects for peace and the hemorrhaging of the blood of the peoples of Palestine, Lebanon, Syria, Egypt, and all the peoples in the Middle East.

54. I come here today before this Council somewhat saddened by the events of the recent few days, which was made more poignant this morning with the murder of a very distinguished American of Palestinian origin, Mr. Alex Odeh, at Santa Ana, California. He was the Director of the American Anti-Arab Discrimination Committee in the region of California. I feel deeply hurt not only as a citizen of the world or as an Arab or somebody who has been very helpful in the struggle against discrimination. I feel that the rhetoric of vengeance that has been prevalent and the recklessness of the utterances that have been made in recent days, and more particularly by the Israeli representatives here and in Israel, have generated an atmosphere of permissiveness towards violence that must cause us to focus again on the root issues in the Middle East.

55. Basically, we believe in non-violence because we feel that violence as a plan of coercion is a negation of non-violence as a practice of persuasion. If there has been justified agitation and anger at the demise of Mr. Klinghoffer, whose circumstances of death are abominable, unspeakable and condemnable, I hope that equally the murder today of Alex Odeh at Santa Ana will evoke similar sympathy and concern.

56. Having said this, I think that the main purpose of the deliberations in the Council is to bring the mechanism of the United Nations to bear and see whether it is possible to resolve the crisis in the Middle East.

57. We believe in negotiations, whether direct or indirect. Yet we do not believe in negotiations that tend, because of the occupation, to be transformed into a way of dictating the terms and the outcome. Hence, our option for the political diplomatic settlement through the United Nations mechanism is clear, categorical and deliberate. It has the approval of all the Arab States, as that approval has been articulated in the resolutions of the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez in 1982.

58. Hence, our commitment is obvious. We want the Security Council to be utilized for the achievement of a peaceful political and diplomatic solution to the issues arising from the Arab-Israeli conflict. We are committed to that.

59. Furthermore, our region is now at the boiling point, and so every incident and every accident in any part of the Arab world is harnessed and used by Israel to gloss over the central issue: the denial to the Palestinians of their right to self-determination. Israel now uses every incident as a prior pretext for subsequent violations and acts of aggression. For instance, we have in recent days seen Israel trying to pinpoint a fringe group which uses reckless tactics and making allegations about the relationship of that fringe group to the PLO, which is recognized by the United Nations, has observer status and is a full member of the League of Arab States. Israel thereby wishes to make the lives and institutions of all Palestinians everywhere in the Arab world more vulnerable.

60. Thus, the systematic television and radio propaganda campaign by Israeli officials during the past few days is a deliberate attempt to picture the aberration that took place on the ship in the Mediterranean as part of a pattern characteristic of the mainstream PLO. This deliberate, systematic, intensive campaign of distortion, innuendos and half-truths is designed to provide the pretext for a repetition of what Israel did to Tunisia last week, to provide the pretext for what it intends to do to other Arab countries any time in the future.

61. We are trying to pre-empt this escalation of violence—whether by fringe groups or by States like Israel that are on the fringes of the international community. For, when Israel was condemned last week for its action against Tunisia, [*resolution 573 (1985)*] it stated that in no circumstances would it abide by the Council's resolution. It therefore was announcing and signalling to the world that it is a pariah in the community of nations. If Israel gets away with this, other pariah groups—whether Palestinians or others—may be infected and feel that they can conduct the same kind of reckless terrorism.

62. Therefore it is important that we refocus on the need and the priority of again providing the political, diplomatic option—the peaceful option. We must re-establish credibility and the chance for the achievement of a peaceful solution. We feel that at this moment there is the proper climate for the convening of an international conference to settle the various outstanding issues in the Middle East conflict.

63. We are looking forward to the forthcoming meeting, at Geneva on 19 November, between the leader of the United States and the leader of the Soviet Union. We think that in itself the decision to have the meeting has generated an atmosphere of hope—limited hope perhaps, but still hope. Of course, we know that the two super-Powers, entrusted with global responsibilities, have their own priorities in terms of disarmament. We are very hopeful that they will be successful in that regard. But we feel, too, that regional conflicts, including the Middle East conflict, can benefit from the defusion of tension and confrontation between the two super-Powers. Hence, in the present climate there is an incentive for the United States and the Soviet Union to work with other members of the Council and the interested parties in the Middle East in order to shoulder, within the framework of the United Nations, a shared responsibility in connection with a problem that was caused by a shared United Nations resolution: the resolution adopted in 1947 [*General Assembly resolution 181 (III)*].

64. Thus, we in the Arab League view the forthcoming meeting of the two super-Powers as an occasion to create a climate that will be conducive—particularly for the United States—to taking up the suggestion for an international

conference, removed from the tensions of the cold war and super-Power competition and confrontation in our region.

65. Moreover, we have consistently stated in the Council and in various resolutions of the League of Arab States that we do not wish to see efforts to settle the Arab-Israeli conflict encourage or exploit Soviet-American tension, competition or confrontation. We want our region to be an arena for the strengthening of détente. We do not want our regional issues to be examined from the viewpoint of Soviet-American or super-Power relations. Rather, we want them to be examined on the basis of the merits of those issues arising in the Middle East.

66. The international conference proposed by the Secretary-General and supported in General Assembly resolutions is not a partisan effort. It is not intended to confirm partisanship. Rather, it is intended to bring about—so far as possible within today's world—an objective framework for dealing with these issues objectively.

67. Unilateral crisis-management in the past—and examples are the early phases of the Camp David agreements and the negotiations on the so-called Lebanese-Israeli agreement—has proved to be counterproductive for the purposes and prospects for peace in the region. We do not want unilateral crisis-management—from any side. We want this crisis in the Middle East to be resolved not only because that would be a contribution to peace in the world, but also because we have an ethical commitment to peace and, in addition, a pragmatic need for peace in order to ensure the development of our region.

68. Therefore, the climate being generated, however reluctantly and grudgingly, and the possibilities of defusing tension and of achieving some success on the global priorities of the two super-Powers means that if regional conflicts, in general, and our regional conflict, in particular, are resolved within the framework of the United Nations, then our regional conflict will no longer feed on and extend to an undermining of relations between the two super-Powers but might, on the contrary, facilitate their priorities in terms of disarmament.

69. I am saying this after the Arab League's careful study of this issue, because we know that in many instances people have felt that the call for an international conference was made by one super-Power and that therefore it has to be opposed by the other. We are saying that our issues, whether it be the Golan Heights, Palestinian self-determination, Israel's attempt at hegemony in southern Lebanon from whence it has not withdrawn until now or other outstanding issues, impact on each other. They are not separate issues; they are not isolated from each other; they must ultimately be related to each other, and hence their resolution must follow the pattern of a simultaneous addressing of the problems.

70. This is why we feel very strongly that the convening of the Security Council and the initiative undertaken by the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries to bring about more active commitment to convene an international conference is overdue, and the sooner the prospects for such a conference are translated into action the better for us and the sooner the causes of violence in the Middle East will be removed.

71. I do not want today to undertake any polemics or to make any attempt at rebuttal. We are well aware that Israel seeks to blackmail the international community by forewarning it that what takes place at an international conference is a form of ganging up. Unfortunately, Israel has persuaded our friends in the United States that the United States has to shield Israel's intransigence lest such a ganging up occurs. The Organization belongs to the international community, in which the United States plays a pivotal role, and, therefore, our expectation is that it will display a pivotal responsibility corresponding to that role. We are eager that the United States examine the issues on their merits, independent from the Israeli attempt to determine or colour the course of events.

72. That is why the League of Arab States and the Arab nation as a whole, in its eagerness to convey and promote dialogue with the United States—inasmuch as we believe, because of the tradition of the United States, that it is a persuadable constituency—express the hope that the United States not, *ab initio*, declare that because Israel rejects the concept of a United Nations international conference, then we all in the international community have to be realistic and in turn abandon the idea. It is crucial that at this moment of agony and hope Israel not practise a vicarious veto on the Council.

73. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada, Secretary-General of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, to whom the Council has extended an invitation at its 2627th meeting under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

74. Mr. PIRZADA: I am thankful to you, Mr. President, and to the members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to participate in my capacity as the Secretary-General of the Organization of the Islamic Conference in the debate on the Middle East problem, including the question of Palestine.

75. The Council is meeting to discuss this problem, which is of major concern to the international community and particularly to the Islamic world, in pursuance of the decision taken at the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Angola in September 1985. The decision to request the convening of this series of meetings was motivated by the desire of the members of the Movement to hold, at the fortieth session of the General Assembly, an in-depth discussion of the problem in all its aspects, to analyse the obstacles in the way of a comprehensive, just and lasting solution of the problem and to find ways and means of removing those obstacles.

76. The current series of meetings is being held against the backdrop of two recent events which have overshadowed the debate. The first was the unprovoked aggression

by Israel against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Tunisia on 1 October, when Israeli aircraft bombed a residential area of Tunis were some offices of the PLO were also housed. The air raid resulted in the loss of more than 60 innocent lives and injury to many others, apart from major damage to property. That was an act of State terrorism which the international community rightly condemned. The second event was the hijacking of a sea-going Italian vessel by four Palestinians, which resulted in the death of an elderly passenger and which was unanimously condemned by the Council in a statement read out by the President at the 2618th meeting on 9 October. This was an act of terrorism by individuals, which we cannot and do not condone. Since then the plane carrying the four hijackers out of Egypt has been intercepted by the United States Air Force and forced to land at a United States military base in Italy, and we understand that the hijackers are now in Italian custody. The United States action in forcing a civilian airliner to land in Italy is a matter which has legal implications which I do not intend to address in my statement, since it would detract from the main focus of the debate.

77. One cannot fail, however, to note that an effort is being made to becloud the basic issue by some participants in the debate who have made this latest act of hijacking by four Palestinians the centre-piece of their statements, without placing it in its proper perspective, namely, that it is one in a series of violent acts, acts of terrorism, in a vicious circle in which individual acts of terrorism are counterposed to acts of State terrorism by Israel.

78. This cycle of violence is a symptom, however, rather than the cause of the conflict in the Middle East. We cannot hope to remove the symptoms without addressing ourselves to the basic cause, which is the denial of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to return, their right to self-determination and their right to an independent State in their homeland, Palestine. The people of Palestine have been dispossessed—they have been forced from their homes, their land and their country. They have been denied their fundamental human rights. They have been suppressed inside the occupied territories and attacked outside them. Their national identity and their existence as a people are at stake. They are denied all means of redress because Israel refuses, and has for decades refused, to heed the calls of the international community to restore the rights of the people of Palestine. It refuses to acknowledge their existence and publicly vows to destroy them. It denies them the legitimacy that it seeks to acquire for itself. It denies them the security and peace that it demands for itself.

79. A nation—a people—is being destroyed. It is futile to expect, to hope or to demand that their desperate acts will cease while they are being trampled beneath the heel of aggression. We must demonstrate to them, show them and make them believe that their rights will be restored to them and that the injustice to which they have been subjected will be undone.

80. The history of the past 40 years is replete with examples of Israeli aggression, expansion and annexation. Whenever the olive branch of peace has been extended to Israel, it has reacted by striking down the hand that holds the branch. Israel has violated the Charter of the United Nations, principles of international law and morality and the norms of inter-State conduct. It has committed aggression against its neighbours as well as against those not in its vicinity.

81. It is occupying Arab and Palestinian lands and is establishing settlements in the West Bank, Gaza and the Golan Heights. It is occupying parts of Lebanon. It defies the will of the international community. It rejects all peace proposals. The Security Council, which under the Charter has the primary responsibility for preserving international peace and security, is helpless because Israel enjoys the backing of a veto-wielding member of the Security Council. We call upon the United States to review its position and its policies and to join the international community in eradicating the injustice that has been done to the people of Palestine.

82. The elements of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East are well known. They have been enunciated in a number of peace proposals. The Arab peace plan of Fez [*see S/15510, annex*] sets them out in a comprehensive manner. The United Nations has identified them. They have been reiterated on countless occasions. Speakers participating in the present debate have recalled them. The PLO has accepted them.

83. The elements of peace are simple. They include the following: first, the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to return, to exercise self-determination and to have a sovereign homeland in Palestine; secondly, the withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Arab and Palestinian territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem; and thirdly, the recognition of the right of all States in the region to exist within secure and internationally recognized boundaries, with justice and security for all peoples. These elements remain unimplemented because of the intransigence of Israel.

84. I believe it is the duty of the Council to ensure the recognition and acceptance of those elements by all parties concerned. The best means to do so has already been approved by the General Assembly [*resolution 38/58 C of 13 December 1983*]—namely, the holding of an international peace conference on the Middle East, under the auspices of the United Nations, with the participation of all parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict, including the PLO, as well as the United States, the Soviet Union and other concerned States, on an equal footing.

85. The need to hold such a conference has never been greater or more urgent. The Council must act. It must not be paralyzed. It must be prepared to exercise its primary functions and it must be ready to apply sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter against those who refuse to implement its decisions. Delays in seeking a comprehensive, just and lasting solution will only exacerbate tension and perpetuate injustice.

86. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the observer for the Palestine Liberation Organization. I invite him to make his statement.

87. Mr. QADDOUMI (Palestine Liberation Organization) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Yesterday, we explained how we tried to co-operate with the Egyptian and Italian authorities so as to save the lives of 400 passengers and crew members who were on the Italian vessel *Achille Lauro*. That vessel was hijacked by a number of Palestinians.

88. Those joint endeavours have put an end to the operation and have saved the vessel and those on board it from dire consequences.

89. Unfortunately, we learned with surprise yesterday that the United States President, Mr. Reagan, had given instructions to the American air base in Sicily to hijack a civilian Egyptian plane en route from Cairo to one of the countries of North Africa. American military jets therefore carried out an operation of air piracy, thus forcing the Egyptian plane to change its route and to land at the American base in Sicily. Is this not a most official act of terrorism? It is terrorism by a super-Power that claims to maintain peace and to resist terrorism while it itself indulges in such terrorism and such acts of piracy.

90. Those who hijacked the Italian vessel were on their way to a Palestinian court. Our brother Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee, had declared in response to a question in an American television interview that the PLO would interrogate them in co-ordination with the Egyptian and Italian authorities. The Chairman of the PLO had already expressed our organization's condemnation of the operation.

91. We must note here that the American military base in Sicily was able to track a single Egyptian aeroplane, but had failed to observe eight Israeli military jets bearing destruction towards a peaceful Arab capital and the PLO offices there.

92. All information and evidence show that the American base was used by the Israeli jets as a springboard for their raid against Tunisia; it must have been used also to fuel those maurauding jets. The United States is feeling the ecstasy of victory, having succeeded in an act of piracy against a civilian aircraft, just as it felt the same ecstasy when American troops invaded the peaceful little Caribbean island of Grenada.

93. I admit that the United Nations is a super-Power capable of taking action beyond what it has already taken, but I cannot understand why such action is not called terrorism and aggression. The United States has arrogated unto itself the right to carry out such acts. It is strange that the United States appeals to the world to save hostages and fight against international terrorism while itself perpetrating such terrorism. What is more, the United States rejected the efforts and good offices of the Egyptian authorities and of the PLO to save the lives of 400 human beings, thus damaging its relations with Egypt; and then it hijacked an Egyptian civilian aeroplane.

94. It is worth recalling that "the road to Hell is paved with good intentions".

95. I wonder whether the arrest of four Palestinians will put an end to violence and terrorism in the Middle East. No, it will not, because Israel is the primary source of aggression and terrorism. It persists in its policy with the support of the United States. Everyone knows that every action results in a like reaction.

96. Occupation, genocide, aggression and the denial of a people's right to self-determination are the cause of all the tragic and painful events taking place in the Middle East, and the source of all of this is Israel and its practices both within and outside the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories.

97. I do not wish here to reply to the statement made yesterday by the representative of Israel, when he emptied his sack of hatred against the Arabs and the Palestinians. Over and over again, we have heard his lame logic, which convinces no one. But I want to address all Israelis. I am a Palestinian citizen who lived in the city of Jaffa on the Mediterranean coast 50 years ago—before the creation of Israel and probably before the representative of Israel so much as set eyes on the land of Palestine. We ask how long Israel will continue to rely on terrorism and aggression in its attempt to remain a small island in the midst of a turbulent ocean of Arabs. Does Israel believe that its technological advancement and its dependence on the United States and on the increasing support provided by that country will bring it peace and security? Does Israel believe it can ever achieve peace, security and good-neighbourly relations with its Arab neighbours? Can Israel annihilate the Palestinian people and eliminate the Palestinian question once and for all? Can Israel convince the world that Israel is Palestine, the homeland of the Palestinians? Does Israel not believe that current Arab incapability will inevitably change into a force capable of protecting Arab rights and of denying Israel a life in peace so long as it denies Palestinian rights, persecutes the Palestinians and hurls threats at the Arab ocean that surrounds it?

98. Does Israel have gold mines and oil wells on which to depend indefinitely, so that it can afford to continue to antagonize its Arab neighbours, continue its acts of aggression against them and persist in its occupation of Palestinian territory?

99. The Palestinians now total 5 million and possess great skills that are no less than those of the Israelis. The Palestinian revolution will continue until the Palestinian people return to their homeland and live peacefully there. Despite all the efforts of Israel and the United States, the Palestinian people will continue to be an impenetrable wall around Israel that will not allow it to engulf the Arab region so that it may coexist in accordance with its logic, the logic of force, arrogance and terrorism. That is the

march of history, and that is the ultimate destiny of the Arab region. The Palestinian State will be established. However long we have to wait, we are confident that justice will prevail despite the arrogance of power and terrorism.

100. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Jordan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

101. Mr. SALAH (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): When considering the Arab-Israeli conflict, and in particular the question of Palestine, which is at its core, the Council must recall the basic facts of the conflict and search for its roots, which nourish the state of violence, instability and extremism in the Middle East. Only by such an approach can we reach a clear understanding and adopt an effective position with regard to the conflict.

102. The past four decades and the five Arab-Israeli wars in those decades have created basic facts that cannot be denied if any consideration of the question is to be fruitful.

103. First, the basic problem in the Middle East is the continued Israeli occupation of the Arab territories since 1967 and the persistent denial of the legitimate rights of the Arab Palestinian people.

104. Secondly, the current circumstances in which the Council is meeting, in particular the increase in acts of terrorism on the one hand and of legitimate resistance on the other, reaffirm the seriousness of the absence of a comprehensive, just peace. They call for prompt action to achieve such a peace.

105. Thirdly, the continuation of a state of no war, no peace might seem beneficial to some, with the tension and instability it entails, but in fact the continuation of such a state is the cause of the terrorism and violence in the region. It is also the cause of the continued resistance to the occupiers.

106. Fourthly, the experience of the past four decades has proved that the time factor is not working in anybody's favour. Those who believe that time works in their favour and against the other party are wrong, because in the absence of justice, the continuation of war and the countless causes of violence have made time a critical factor, pouring salt on the wounds, while consolidating rejection and extremism. Experience has taught us that time can either run against the interests of all if it is used to strengthen the tendency to aggression and expansion, or be in the interests of all if it is used properly through the adoption of flexibility and moderation.

107. On the basis of those fundamental facts, Jordan has worked sincerely and consistently to reach a comprehensive, just and lasting political solution which would end the state of no war, no peace, with all the extremism, terrorism and violence it entails. That has been Jordan's approach since the very beginning, for it has participated in the formulation of a number of peace initiatives and has welcomed all international efforts in that regard.

108. In its search for the best path to peace, Jordan, in co-operation with its Arab brothers and in particular the Palestinian people, has advocated the political option to solve the Arab-Israeli conflict on the basis of the principle that has become the foundation of international unanimity—that of territory in return for peace. That approach was also manifested in the Arab context in the resolutions of the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez in 1982, in which the Arabs accepted a political solution on the basis of trading land for peace. Nevertheless, such international unanimity has not led to the establishment of peace in the Middle East. The situation remains unchanged. Yet there is one glaring reality that cannot be denied—the need to achieve a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East, in the formulation of which the Palestinians would participate from the beginning. They would also take part guaranteeing it through their legitimate leadership, the PLO, which has declared its commitment to the principle of peace and coexistence, based on a guarantee of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people. With such a commitment the PLO gives expression to the hopes of the Palestinian people, languishing under the yoke of occupation, and responds to its wish to rid itself of that occupation.

109. The Palestinian people's call for freedom and its wish for self-determination in a just and lasting peace, in the formulation and guaranteeing of which that people will participate, has been expressed on various occasions through its legitimate leadership, the PLO. The Palestinian people has declared categorically and clearly its commitment to the distinct special relationship that links it to the Jordanian people. It has called for the translation of that relationship into a positive political reality—the development and consolidation of joint Palestinian-Jordanian action. We in Jordan have welcomed it as an expression of our national approach and our awareness that that joint action strengthens the hopes of our people languishing under the yoke of occupation to be free and to rid themselves of that occupation.

110. Consistent with all I have mentioned, as an expression of the true desire for peace and recognition of its importance by both Jordan and the PLO, and on the basis of our commitment to the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, in particular their right to self-determination, Jordan and the PLO jointly formulated the Palestinian-Jordanian accord of 11 February 1985. That accord is an expression of reality and the historical relationship between the Palestinian and the Jordanian peoples. It also constitutes an appropriate mechanism for fulfilment of the Arab aspirations to peace expressed in resolutions adopted at Fez in 1982. It proceeds from the principles and the spirit of those resolutions and affirms the wish of the Palestinian people to achieve self-determination while maintaining the relations of unity and the national bonds dear to the hearts of all Arabs.

111. The accord takes into consideration the realities of the Arab and regional situation from a serious and objective perspective. It also deals with the way in which the major Powers and the international community would participate in the achievement of peace. Thus the accord takes into account the need to convene an international conference in which peace negotiations between the interested parties would take place.

112. The Palestinian-Jordanian accord calls for the convening of an international conference to be attended by all parties concerned in addition to the permanent members of the Security Council. Invitations to such a conference would be dispatched by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The accord states that such a conference would be an appropriate framework for achievement of the desired comprehensive settlement. I need not recall here that that formula is not a new one. But it is the best we have found; it is an applicable, appropriate method of facilitating the peace process. In recalling the positions of the parties concerned, we find they have all supported the convening of such a conference at one stage or another; in turn, they have called on the Security Council and the United Nations to achieve that end. In this regard I should like to point out that political arrangements have been made previously in this context, following the October war of 1973. The call of Jordan and the PLO, as the parties most immediately concerned, for the convening of such a conference is justified politically and morally. We believe the convening of that conference would enhance the possibilities of international *détente*, in addition to being the optimum way to achieve peace in the Middle East—peace, which is the most important goal for all of us. We do not believe that the convening of that conference would strengthen the negotiating position of one party at the expense of the other party. Furthermore, we believe the conference would be practical and useful, not a rostrum for polemics and the making of statements.

113. Proceeding from that, we conceive the importance of our joint political movement with the PLO as being embodied in the Palestinian-Jordanian accord signed on 11 February 1985 at Amman. Any Palestinian-Jordanian accord cannot fail to make a positive contribution to peace and stability. It has been an Arab demand as well as an international one. It has enjoyed international and Arab support. Here we should like to place on record our thanks to all those who have welcomed the accord, whether inside this Council or outside it. We hope it will be similarly supported by all, because it is in fact a sincere and serious effort on our part.

114. Finally I should like to affirm that if the current events in our region prove anything it is the importance of rapid movement towards peace. It is essential to achieve peace, and we believe it is possible to do so through an international conference and on the basis of the Palestinian-Jordanian accord. Therefore we expect and urge the parties concerned to adopt more positive and flexible positions in order to enhance the possibility of peace.

115. That was affirmed by King Hussein in his statement before the General Assembly on 27 September last, when he said:

> "A rare, historic opportunity now lies before the United Nations, an opportunity for a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. This opportunity should not be missed, as has been the case with many previous ones. Without your efforts and support, I am afraid that the budding promise of peace will wither before it has had the chance to grow. Let us marshal our resources in the cause of peace. Let us make our concern for the future the only constraint in our calculations. Faith in peace is the cornerstone of the United Nations, just as the United Nations is the cornerstone of peace, which is itself the basis of all progress and prosperity."[1]

116. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

117. Mr. BEIN (Israel): I should like to begin by conveying to the representatives a statement issued today by my country's Minister for Foreign Affairs, which expresses satisfaction and appreciation for the resolute action of the United States in intercepting the aircraft carrying the four PLF [*Palestine Liberation Front*] terrorists responsible for the despicable act of piracy against the *Achille Lauro*. This courageous American act directed against Palestinian international terrorism represents an essential step towards the eradication of global terrorism.

118. From the vantage-point of the gallery, where my delegation has chosen to sit, we have for the past two days listened to a debate that borders on the absurd and acts to degrade the Council which insulting the intelligence of most of its members.

119. We all know the truth. None of the representatives sitting around this table is that naive or ignorant. We have witnessed a procession of speakers claiming to address the situation in the Middle East. Yet with the exception of the representative of Israel, none of the speakers directed their attention to the many conflicts that are consuming the Middle East, as we speak.

120. I shall not repeat the list of inter-Arab conflicts which are raging throughout the Middle East and spilling over into the continents of Africa and Asia. As everyone here knows those conflicts have been exported through PLO terrorism to the continent of Europe as well.

121. Instead, we have listened to speeches that would lead one to believe that the whole Middle East is confined to the small area that comprises the State of Israel. This barrage of anti-Israeli propaganda only serves to deflect the Council's attention from the real issue: PLO terrorism and the danger it poses to world security.

122. The international community is still suffering from the most recent act of PLO terror. The murder of Mr. Klinghoffer—may his soul rest in peace—will not go away. The attempts made by representatives to divert the Council's attention away from this heinous crime will not succeed.

123. Yasser Arafat once again is trying to transform his crime into a personal victory. By now everyone here knows that this terrorist act was perpetrated by the Abu Abbas faction of the PLO, with full prior knowledge and approval of Arafat himself. Yet, Arafat continues to deny any complicity whatsoever. This is the usual well-known pattern, and the world is not so foolish as to believe those lies. I want to bring out some of the most recent examples of this pattern of PLO lies.

124. Lie number one. When the Israeli Air Force on 1 October bombed the PLO headquarters and facilities in Tunisia, Arafat declared—and we heard this lie here again, just now—that United States Armed Forces had participated in the operation. The fact: The United States not only had had no part in the operation, but had no knowledge of it until the American Ambassador had been informed of it after the raid had been completed.

125. Lie number two. When Jerusalem city bus No. 18 was exploded by Fatah terrorists on 6 December 1983, killing 4 persons and injuring 46, all of them civilians, many of them women and children, Arafat said that the blown-up vehicle had been an army bus. The fact: If that city bus in Arafat's lexicon was an army bus, then apparently the PLO cannot distinguish between women or children and soldiers, between brightly coloured city buses and army transport vehicles.

126. Lie number three. When an organization calling itself "Black September" committed outrageous murderous terrorist acts in 1972, blowing up planes in Jordan and murdering the Israeli athletes in the Olympiad of Munich, Arafat at first disclaimed any connection with or knowledge of the group. The fact: Later it was revealed that Black September was a code name for Arafat's own Fatah.

127. Lie number four. Arafat denied all connection with the seizure of the Saudi Arabian Embassy in Khartoum, in March 1973, and the murder of the United States Ambassador, the United States Chargé d'Affaires and the Belgian Chargé d'Affaires. The fact: It turned out that the crime had been perpetrated by the Black September faction of the PLO and that the order to kill the diplomats had been telephoned to the terrorists personally by Yasser Arafat.

128. The world must never condone such flagrant lies. Yesterday in this very chamber we heard one representative imply that Mr. Klinghoffer—may his soul rest in peace—was not killed, that perhaps he had died of natural causes. How dare he continue this charge? How dare you continue this charade?

129. At the same time that the PLO has been disavowing any responsibility for those terrorist acts, it has been issuing statements all along that boast of its intentions to increase this kind of terrorist acts. On 15 May 1985, in a broadcast from Baghdad the Voice of Palestine said: "Seaborne action will continue no matter what the losses." And again in June 1985, in a broadcast from Sana'a, the Voice of Palestine repeated the threat by saying: "Attacks from the sea will continue."

130. On the one hand, we see the PLO committing itself to terror and murder of innocent civilians and, on the other, denying any responsibility. This is truly a farce. However, there remains a central truth, that the victims of Arafat's lethal game are innocent people everywhere. The countries of the free world must unite and combine their efforts to ensure that the PLO's reign of terror is brought to an end.

131. Israel has repeatedly called upon all countries in the Middle East to negotiate a peace agreement. To date, only one such agreement has been concluded. We again call upon our neighbours—all our neighbour countries—to follow the model provided by Camp David: direct negotiations without preconditions. That is the only way to proceed.

132. We fervently hope that reason will prevail and peace will come to our region of the world.

133. We look forward to the time when the Security Council will be the scene of co-operation and constructive diplomacy instead of wasting the time of the representatives with futile declarations.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

NOTES

[1] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, Nos. 970-973.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fortieth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 6th meeting, paras. 195 and 196.

[3] *Ibid.*, 12th meeting, para. 44.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى: الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61439—March 1995—1,925

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2623rd MEETING: 17 OCTOBER 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2623)	1
The question of South Africa:	
Statement by the President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/17557)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2623rd MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 17 October 1985, at 11.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Vernon A. WALTERS
(United States of America).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2623)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the Middle East:
   Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/17557)

The meeting was called to order at 12.10 p.m.

The question of South Africa:
Statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT: At the outset of this meeting I wish to make the following statement on behalf of the members of the Security Council:

"The members of the Security Council have learned with indignation and the gravest concern of the South African authorities' intention to implement the death sentence imposed on Malesela Benjamin Moloise, in spite of the Council's appeals in this regard.

"The members of the Council once again draw the attention of the South African authorities to the Council President's statement of 20 August 1985 [*S/17408*] and Council resolution 547 (1984), which, *inter alia*, called upon the South African authorities not to carry out the execution of Mr. Moloise.

"The members of the Council are convinced that the carrying out of the execution will only result in a further worsening of an extremely grave situation.

"Once again, the members of the Council strongly urge the South African Government to extend clemency to Mr. Moloise and to rescind his death sentence."

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/17557)

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Lebanon in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. El-Turk (Lebanon) took a place at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) for the period from 12 April to 10 October 1985 [*S/17557*]. Members of the Council also have before them document S/17526, which contains the text of a letter dated 3 October 1985 from the representative of Lebanon to the Secretary-General, and S/17567, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.

4. It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall now put it to the vote.

A vote was taken by a show of hands.

In favour: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against: None

Abstaining: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

The draft resolution was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions [resolution 575 (1985)].

5. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

6. Mr. LIANG Yufan (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation consistently holds that the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon must be respected. Proceeding from this basic stand, and in view of the request from the Lebanese Government, China voted in favour of the resolution which the Council has just adopted, by which the Council authorizes the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL for another six months. We hope that in the next six months a fundamental improvement can be achieved in the situation of UNIFIL, which has been unable to perform its duties.

7. The Council assigned a clear mandate to UNIFIL in its resolution 425 (1978), namely, to confirm the withdrawal of Israeli forces, restore international peace and security and assist the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area. Regrettably, however, that mandate has so far not been truly carried out, despite the lapse of seven years. We must point out emphatically that such a state of affairs is far from normal and needs to be changed promptly.

8. We maintain that the Israeli authorities should be held responsible for this abnormal situation. By its massive invasion of Lebanon in 1982, Israel defied the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and completely ignored UNIFIL, bringing serious damage to the credibility of both the Interim Force and the United Nations. The so-called security zone set up by Israel in southern Lebanon constitutes the basic obstacle to the functioning of UNIFIL. Therefore the elimination of the aftermath of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, including the dismantling of the security zone and the total withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanese territory, is a prerequisite for the normal functioning of UNIFIL, the recovery of Lebanese sovereignty over southern Lebanon and the restoration of international peace and security in the area. The Council should take effective measures to attain these objectives.

9. The Chinese delegation fully shares the view expressed by the Secretary-General in paragraph 37 of his report, that a decision by the Council on the extension of the mandate must not be understood to mean that UNIFIL will be allowed to become an open-ended commitment for the troop-contributing countries and for the United Nations.

10. In conclusion, the Chinese delegation wishes to take this opportunity to express its sincere thanks to the troop-contributing countries and the officers and men of UNIFIL.

11. Mr. de KÉMOULARIA (France) (*interpretation from French*): France has just expressed through its vote its support for the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL and thus for the activities and role of the Force. It has thus responded to the request made by the Lebanese Government in this regard. My Government considers that despite the many obstacles that it has encountered, UNIFIL's action has been positive, in particular because it assures an international presence that is indispensable in a particularly sensitive region.

12. In this connection, my delegation is in agreement with the analysis of the situation submitted by the Secretary-General in his report. The situation prevailing in Lebanon south of the Litani is dangerous, and the events that took place yesterday provide new testimony to that. UNIFIL is caught between two hostile forces and continues to be prevented, in contravention of Council resolutions, from deploying its personnel up to the international border, as provided for in its mandate. France again insists on the need for comprehensive application as soon as possible of Council resolution 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) through negotiations with the parties concerned.

13. Furthermore, we believe that, as is stressed in the report, the extension of the mandate, however justified it may be at present, should not be construed as an open-ended commitment by the contributing countries to maintain UNIFIL, and consequently to provide it with the necessary contingents, indefinitely.

14. I share the concern expressed by the Secretary-General at the sizeable financial deficit that has accumulated so far and which is being borne by those States participating in the United Nations operation. It is therefore advisable that all members of the international community pay their contributions without delay and fulfil their responsibilities.

15. As members of the Council are aware, my country has spared no effort to ensure that it is represented by a significant contingent in the Force. France will therefore maintain its participation at the same level in terms of troops.

16. We also wish to reiterate our interest in the humanitarian and security aspects of the action that UNIFIL carries out in the spirit of resolution 523 (1982). It is very largely thanks to its presence that southern Lebanon is enjoying a little peace and security.

17. My delegation also wishes to express its concern at the continuous attacks that UNIFIL has to face and at the prospect of renewed violence in that part of Lebanon.

18. I would also inform the members of the Council that my country and the French public in general are concerned about the situation of tens of thousands of Christian Lebanese besieged in the city of Jazzin. We know that our concern is shared by many countries. I therefore wish to reaffirm today that my country remains ready, if circumstances so demand, and in liaison with the Lebanese Government, to consider action by UNIFIL to ensure the protection of Jazzin.

19. I conclude by associating myself with the Secretary-General in the hope so wisely expressed in the conclusions to his report, namely, that there is still a good chance of re-establishing peace in Lebanon, a country that has suffered for so long and with which my country has so many ties.

20. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Security

Council has been convened today to extend once again the mandate of UNIFIL. It is worth recalling that this is the 18th extension of the mandate of that Force since it was set up in March 1978.

21. In paragraph 4 of the last resolution on this item, resolution 561 (1985), the Council reiterates that "the Force should fully implement its mandate as defined in resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978) and all other relevant resolutions". Today, half a year later, we see that that resolution, like many other Council decisions on Lebanon—primarily the basic resolutions 425 (1978), 508 (1982) and 509 (1982)—has not been fulfilled, and the Force continues to be prevented from fulfilling the mandate conferred on it by the Council.

22. What has changed in the situation in southern Lebanon over the past six months? The answer to that question is clear from the report of the Secretary-General that is now before the Council. When Israel redeployed its troops, it handed over the border regions of southern Lebanon it claimed to be a "security zone" to the control of its mercenaries, the so-called South Lebanon Army, after having co-opted to that force its own military personnel in the guise of instructors and advisers. Of course, no one can have the slightest doubt that the Lahad gangs are about as independent in their actions as are puppets in a puppet theatre, and I do not think even the representative of Israel would contest that.

23. However, things have not stopped there. Israel has also left its own military units in the border zones, some in the area where the troops of UNIFIL are deployed. According to *The Washington Post* of 1 October, Israeli tank and mechanized units are stationed to the north of the Norwegian UNIFIL contingent as well as in the area under the responsibility of the Finnish UNIFIL batallions. As a result, as the Secretary-General notes in his report, the Force is hemmed in among the many positions occupied by the Israeli Army and its mercenaries and is being systematically subjected to armed attacks and bombardment.

24. The criminal practice of punitive operations continues, as does collective punishment directed against the civilian population of southern Lebanon. Israel's continuing occupation of part of Lebanese territory has quite naturally given rise to legitimate resistance by the Lebanese, who have been waging a valiant struggle to expel the aggressor from their land once and for all. Thus we cannot help but agree with the Secretary-General's conclusion in paragraph 33 of his report that "the current situation in Lebanon south of the Litani is not only unsatisfactory but also dangerous."

25. This situation cannot fail to give rise to the most serious concern. For more than seven and a half years, Israel has continued, either directly or through its mercenaries, to hold sway in Lebanon, defiantly refusing to implement the many resolutions of the Council that have clearly called for a complete and unconditional withdrawal of its troops from Lebanon. It is well known who stands behind Israel and who prevents the Council from calling the aggressor to book and ensuring fulfilment of its decisions, including those relating to the implementation of the UNIFIL mandate. The United States would do well to bear in mind the fact that such action seriously undermines the Council's prestige and effectiveness.

26. The Soviet Union decisively condemns Israel's continuing occupation of Lebanese territory and expresses its solidarity with the struggle of the Lebanese people to bring about the definitive expulsion of the aggressors from its ancestral lands.

27. It is important to guarantee fulfilment of the decisions taken by the Security Council and to see to it that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon are respected and that an end finally be put to the tyranny being practised against the civilian population.

28. The withdrawal of Israeli troops to the Israeli side of the border and the cessation of Israel's interference in the affairs of Lebanon would create conditions in which UNIFIL would be able freely to carry out the mandate entrusted it. With this in mind, and taking into consideration the request of the Lebanese Government and the recommendations of the Secretary-General, the Soviet delegation did not object to the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL for a further interim period. We abstained in the voting for reasons that we have set forth in detail at prior Council meetings.

29. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): There is no need for me to speak at length in explanation of my delegation's positive vote. My delegation's views are well known, as a result of our statements on previous similar occasions.

30. It remains our belief that the Council's objectives must be to secure a speedy and complete withdrawal of all Israeli forces, to establish peace and security in the area and to restore effective Lebanese authority and sovereignty up to the internationally recognized border. We accept the Secretary-General's view that the balance of advantage lies in renewing the mandate of UNIFIL for a further six months. At the same time we agree with him that continuation of the present situation in southern Lebanon is both unsatisfactory and dangerous.

31. It would be a mistake to believe that no harm is being done by Israel's policy of maintaining a so-called security zone on Lebanese soil and preventing UNIFIL from carrying out its mandate. On the contrary, real damage is being done to the chances of restoring stable and peaceful conditions in southern Lebanon. Opportunities are wasted, goodwill squandered and violent extremism encouraged. We appeal to those involved to face this realistically.

32. We take note with approval of the Secretary-General's observation that extension of the mandate of UNIFIL cannot be allowed to become an open-ended commitment for the troop-contributing countries and for the United Nations if the requisite conditions for the effective operation of the Force continue to be absent.

33. The Council cannot ignore the important effect that UNIFIL has already had on a dangerous situation, a situation which could cause a new threat to international peace and security, nor can the Council be indifferent to the trust of the local population, whose safety and well-being depend in large measure on the continuing efforts of the United Nations, and on UNIFIL in particular. This is why my Government once again joins the Secretary-General in appealing strongly to all Member States to pay their assessments to the UNIFIL Special Account, now in deficit to the tune of $US 224 million. This is an expense which is much more important and for a more important cause than many other projects to which the delegations at present in default contribute money.

34. We are most grateful to the Secretary-General and his staff for his report and for his continuing efforts. In addition, we extend our thanks and congratulations to the troop-contributing countries. This leads me, finally, to join others in paying a sincere tribute to Lieutenant-General Callaghan and all the personnel of UNIFIL and the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization for their courageous and devoted work and, in particular, their humanitarian efforts in most difficult circumstances.

35. Mr. ULRICH (Denmark): My delegation has closely studied the latest report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL. We are deeply concerned about the situation in Lebanon south of the Litani as assessed by the Secretary-General.

36. The so-called security zone arrangement maintained north of the Israeli-Lebanese border is contrary to Security Council resolutions and has meant that UNIFIL finds itself in the midst of mutually hostile forces and is precluded from deploying right up to the international border in accordance with its mandate.

37. We have taken note of the Secretary-General's prediction that if the Israeli presence in the "security zone" continues for long, violence will inevitably escalate and spread, making UNIFIL's situation even more difficult.

38. Denmark therefore joins the Secretary-General in hoping that the Israeli authorities will conclude that, of all the options available, the effective implementation of UNIFIL's mandate would in the long run be the least hazardous for all concerned.

39. My Government once again urges that UNIFIL should be allowed to carry out the mandate laid down for it by the Security Council, namely, to assist the Lebanese Government in controlling the Lebanese border area and to provide security for both sides of that border.

40. My delegation should like to pay tribute to Lieutenant-General Callaghan, his staff and the officers and men of UNIFIL for the exemplary dedication and courage with which they have carried out their difficult tasks.

41. I should also like to express our sincere appreciation to the Secretary-General and his colleagues for their untiring efforts. The Secretary-General can count on my Government's full support in his continuing efforts to establish a firm basis for international peace and security in the area.

42. Everyone should seriously note his belief that there is still a good chance of re-establishing international peace and security in Lebanon south of the Litani if the correct actions are taken soon by all concerned, but that further undue delay is likely to produce a new and serious crisis, possibly with widespread ramifications.

43. The PRESIDENT: I shall now speak in my capacity as representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

44. Since my country was referred to, I believe it might be well that those who wish to tell others how to support Council decisions should at least pay their share of the cost of supporting UNIFIL.

45. I now resume my functions as PRESIDENT of the Council.

46. I call on the representative of Lebanon.

47. Mr. EL-TURK (Lebanon) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to begin, Sir, by congratulating you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I should also like to express our complete confidence in your skill, experience and wisdom in directing the work of the Council in the right direction. Furthermore, I wish to express to your predecessor, Sir John Thomson, the representative of the United Kingdom, our appreciation for the constructive role he played in presiding over the work of the Council in September.

48. Following the vote on the draft resolution on extending the mandate of UNIFIL for a further six months, I must convey the thanks and appreciation of the delegation of Lebanon to the Council for acceding to the request of the Lebanese Government. I must furthermore pay tribute to the Secretary-General and his assistants for the excellent efforts they have made, which have been described in detail in his report.

49. I feel duty bound on this occasion to commend the work done by the Force, in conditions which are often difficult and sometimes dangerous because of the numerous obstacles created and acts of harassment carried out by the Israeli forces as well as by the illegitimate forces collaborating with them. We express Lebanon's gratitude and appreciation to UNIFIL, its leaders, soldiers and administrators. We would also express our appreciation to the States contributing to UNIFIL because they made possible the implementation of the wishes of the international community represented in the Council, and thus provided a shining example of what States can undertake within the appropriate framework to translate expressions of international solidarity into practice.

50. On this occasion, I must recall the Lebanese position, which is based on firm principles and foundations and has been expounded by Lebanon on many previous occasions in the Council. That position is in general based on the following:

—First, full implementation of resolution 425 (1978), which, in the light of the Lebanese request, included provision for the establishment of an international interim force for Southern Lebanon to ensure the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon, the restoration of international peace and security and assistance to the Government of Lebanon in restoring its effective authority in the area.

—Secondly, in conformity with that resolution, Israel must withdraw completely from Lebanese territories so as to allow the Force to carry out the task entrusted to it under resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978). Lebanon rejects the presence of any armed Israeli forces, regardless of the number and equipment of this presence and regardless whether it is overt or veiled.

—Thirdly, we reject the presence of any illegitimate collaborationist forces linked with Israel, and especially the so-called South Lebanon Army.

—Fourthly, we reject the principle of an Israeli security zone inside Lebanese territory.

—Fifthly, we reject all violation of the sanctity of Lebanese territories, air space and territorial waters.

—Sixthly, we condemn all forms of Israeli practices and inhuman acts in southern Lebanon.

51. The Lebanese delegation, while hoping that efforts made during the renewed mandate of UNIFIL will bear fruit and induce Israel to implement Council resolutions by withdrawing completely from Lebanese territories, at the same time welcomes any other initiatives that might produce the desired result. The Lebanese delegation appeals for support of the efforts of the Secretary-General and his assistants aimed at achieving this end.

52. Pending this outcome, we believe that the Force is carrying out its task in southern Lebanon with great courage and effectiveness. We believe that the presence of the Interim Force, despite the problems and difficulties it faces from time to time, is an important expression of the Security Council's commitment to assisting Lebanon to cope with continuing violations of the sanctity of its sovereignty and helping the Lebanese Government to restore its authority over all its territory within internationally recognized borders.

53. In addition, we appreciate the efforts made by UNIFIL to provide protection and humanitarian assistance for the local inhabitants in the areas where it is deployed. At the same time, we believe that the absence of international forces or the failure of those forces fully to carry out their mission will lead to further acts of violence and to increased tension in southern Lebanon as well as to instability in the region. Moreover, it would also demonstrate a weakening of international will and would be a victory for the principle of force; it would be a public admission by the Council of its inability to shoulder the international tasks entrusted to it.

54. Lebanon continues to believe that the Council is capable of assuming its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. We continue to believe that the Council desires the implementation of the resolutions it adopts, because of its firm belief in the rightfulness of the claim by any State to the safeguarding of its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

55. More than 10 years have passed since the outbreak of the Lebanese tragedy and the attendant suffering of the Lebanese people. The time has come for our nation, which has participated in the march of history for thousands of years and which was the birthplace of many civilizations, for a people like the peace-loving Lebanese people to be spared further bloodshed, tears and spiraling violence and destruction. The time has come for them to regain their sovereignty and territorial integrity. The time has come for the Lebanese people to resume a normal life and to take up again its creative endeavours.

56. Let us hope that the next time the Council meets to consider this item, it will be witness to the realization of those hopes.

57. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Israel in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

It was so decided.

58. The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of Israel to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

59. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): My participation in this discussion is prompted by two sets of remarks. The first was from the Soviet representative, and I shall deal with that quickly and then proceed to the second point.

60. The Soviet representative spoke about the ills of occupation and the ills of puppet régimes. He is right to speak about this; he could start directing those words to his own Government for its actions in Afghanistan, which are known to everybody here. But since he wants to address them to the Middle East, and specifically since he wants to address them to Lebanon, he has a ready address of occupation and of puppet régimes, and members of the Council know where that address lies—and it is not Israel.

We have absolutely no interest, no claim, no desire whatsoever regarding the question of territorial claims on Lebanon, or any other desires regarding Lebanon.

61. Lebanon, frankly, is not our interest. Our interest is one: security; security for people in the north of Israel, to prevent them from suffering the kind of calamities and attacks they have experienced over the last decade—actually, since the early 1970s, with the collapse of Lebanon's effective sovereignty and its domination first by the PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization) and then by Syria.

62. The problem of preventing cross-border attacks is the true domain of this discussion, because, in fact, that is the purpose of UNIFIL. The purpose of UNIFIL is not, as members know, to deal with the question of domestic tranquillity inside Lebanon or the terrible tragedies that have beset that country and still beset it every day. The purpose of UNIFIL is to ensure that there is no cross-border violence, that there is no continuous problem that involves international—and I stress the word "international"—peace and security.

63. I move on now to the second issue, and that is the question of international security. In the Council six months ago I heard the same predictions and prognoses as today: that the problem would deteriorate, that we would find ourselves in a difficult situation as far as the border between Israel and Lebanon and attacks on Israel are concerned. This was said not by countries that obviously want to attack Israel at every opportunity, but by people, I think, of good will and by representatives of countries of good will, who had that assessment as a fair difference of opinion with us. We argued at the time that we thought that this problem, the problem of international peace and security—that is, the problem of preventing attacks against Israel—is a problem of how to prevent terrorist attacks, which are continuously launched, from penetrating the southern cordon, given that there is no strong central Government in Lebanon.

64. The arrangements that we discussed proved to be successful, contrary to the expectations of many in this chamber. The attacks and the attempts were there—they are there all the time—but the successful attacks have, in fact, been very, very few. In fact, in the year since Israel withdrew from Lebanon we have had 12 car-bomb attacks—none of them has been successful—but the curve of attacks, even of attempts, rather than increasing, has been sharply declining. That reality—the fact that the south of Lebanon is its most traquil part and that there is relative calm there—is indeed reflected in the relevant passage in the Secretary-General's report.

65. Thus, the root question that faces us is the structural problem of Lebanon, and its domination, and the absence of a strong central Government which could police that area. UNIFIL cannot police that area, just as it cannot do what at least one representative here has called for, that is police the domestic strife in Jazzin and elsewhere. Great tragedies are occurring there and might occur there. But if UNIFIL wants to direct itself simply to the question of bloodshed, then it has many, many other areas to deal with in Lebanon where the needs are far greater and more pressing.

66. In short, the problem is not sovereignty; the problem is security. The problem is not even bloodshed; it belongs elsewhere. As far as UNIFIL is concerned, because it is not able structurally to stop terrorism, because it can only serve as a buffer between two Governments and because there is no sufficiently strong Government on one side, it is structurally unable to fulfil the mandate—or at least it is very, very difficult for it to fulfil the mandate as long as that reality prevails.

67. Therefore, our position on UNIFIL is that we do not think it has a useful role. We are not going to raise any objection, and I do not raise one here, with respect to the Council's decision, but we think that the reality is such that the only possibility for maintaining security in that area is the present situation as it exists.

68. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61439—March 1995—1,925